

Appl. No. : 10/672,906
Filed : September 25, 2003

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 18, 2006, Applicant has amended the application as above. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 21-38 have been added. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 21-38 are pending in this application. New Claims are supported by, for example, Figures 3A, 3B and 4A. Thus, the amendments to the claims do not introduce any new matter. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim, et. al (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,343). As discussed above, Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-6, and added new Claims 21-38. Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable over the Kim reference as discussed below.

Standard of Anticipation

“For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.” *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 850 F.2d 675, 677, 7 USPQ 2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Discussion of Patentability of Independent Claim 21

Independent Claim 21 recites, among other things, that *a closed slit is located between adjacent sub pixel electrodes*, and the portion of the common electrode line is under the closed slit. Applicant respectfully submits that Kim does not disclose the above-recited feature as discussed below.

Kim discloses that the pixel electrode (90) is divided into three partitions (91-93), arguably corresponding to the claimed plurality of sub pixel electrodes, connected via first and second connections (94, 95). The second partition (92) is connected to the first partition (91) via the first connection (94). The second partition (92) is connected to the third partition (93) via the

Appl. No. : 10/672,906
Filed : September 25, 2003

second connection (95). There is a single gap or slit between the second and third partitions (92, 93). Also, there are two gaps or slits between the second and first partitions (92, 91). *See Figure 1A and column 4 line 56 to column 5 line 2.* However, in Kim, none of the slits are surrounded by adjacent partitions. That is, each slit in Kim is an open slit. Thus, Kim does not teach or suggest that a closed slit is located between adjacent sub pixel electrodes recited in Claim 21.

Discussion of Patentability of Independent Claim 30

Independent Claim 30 recites, among other things, that a slit is located between adjacent sub pixel electrodes, and the slit is *within the common electrode*. Applicant respectfully submits that Kim does not disclose the above-recited feature as discussed below.

Kim discloses that the second and the third storage electrodes (32, 33), arguably corresponding to the claimed common electrode, are located between the second and the third partitions (92, 93) and between the first and the second partitions (91, 92), respectively. The slit between the second and third partitions (92, 93) is wider than the second storage electrode (32). Furthermore, both of the slits between the second and first partitions (92, 91) are wider than the third storage electrode (33). *See Figure 1A and column 5 lines 3-6.* It is clear that none of the slits in Kim can be within the storage electrodes (32, 33). Therefore, Kim does not disclose that the slit is within the common electrode recited in Claim 30.

Summary

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 21 and 30 are not anticipated by Kim. Furthermore, since the above-recited features of the claimed invention are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art reference, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been made obvious over the cited prior art. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 21 and 30 are allowable over the Kim reference.

Discussion of Patentability of Dependent Claims

Claims 22-29 and 31-38 depend from base Claim 21 or 30, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of their base claims, and in

Appl. No. : **10/672,906**
Filed : **September 25, 2003**

further view of the additional technical features, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : 10/672,906
Filed : September 25, 2003

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicant's foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____

12/15/06

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

3207114
121306